



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/991,759	11/23/2001	Narciso Jaramillo	1279	3962
30748	7590	08/09/2005	EXAMINER	
INNOVATION PARTNERS 540 UNIVERSITY DRIVE SUITE 300 PALO ALTO, CA 94301			LUU, SY D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

09/991,759

Applicant(s)

JARAMILLO, NARCISO

Examiner

Sy D. Luu

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 May 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 November 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the Amendment filed May 16, 2005.
2. Claims 1-66 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 23, and 45 are independent claims. This action is made Final.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-9, 11, 23-26, 28, 30-31, 33, 45-48, 50, 52-53 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA", Specification pages 1-3).

As per claims 1, 4 and 11, AAPA teaches a method of editing a set of information comprising a plurality of objects, the method comprising:

receiving a first set of at least one command in a graphical editor, said graphical editor allowing the information in the set be edited by graphical manipulation of graphical representations of the plurality of the objects, said graphical representations comprising at least one selected from a graphic and a text character, and wherein the first set of at least one command comprises a selection of at least one of the plurality of objects (page 2, lines 8-23); and

displaying at a location on a display screen a text-based editor for at least one selected from: adding text to, and altering text of, a portion of the information, the portion and the

location responsive to at least the first set of at least one command, wherein the information comprises source code for a web page and graphical information (page 3, lines 1-7).

As per claim 2, AAPA teaches the steps of receiving from an author at least one text alteration via the text-based editor, and altering the information responsive to the receipt of the at least one text alteration and the first set of at least one command (page 3, lines 1-7).

As per claim 3, AAPA teaches the steps of receiving a second set of at least one command after at least a portion of the first set of at least one command is received, and wherein the altering step is responsive to the second set of at least one command (page 3, lines 1-7; *iterative steps of the limitations previously recited*).

As per claim 6, AAPA teaches the first set of at least one command to comprise an indication of a location of an insertion point (page 3, lines 1-4; *moving the cursor to the exact location that needs to be updated which also includes insertion*).

As per claims 8-9, AAPA teaches at least a plurality of the plurality of objects each comprise a command, and the text based editor allowing at least one selected from an addition and an alteration of not more than one of said commands at one time and an addition of not more than one additional command at a time, wherein said commands each comprise not more than one begin tag and the additional command comprises not more than one additional begin tag (page 3, lines 1-9; *tags are inherent elements of source code of web pages*).

Claims 23-26, 28, 30-31 and 33 are similar in scope to claims 1-4, 6, 8-9 and 11 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 45-48, 50, 52-53 and 55 are similar in scope to claims 1-4, 6, 8-9 and 11 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 5, 7, 10, 14, 27, 29, 32, 36, 49, 51, 54 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA", Specification pages 1-3) in view of Carroll (US 6,762,777 B2).

As per claim 5, AAPA does not teach the location to be responsive to a location of the at least one object selected, or wherein the displaying step to comprise displaying the text-based editor responsive to the location of the insertion point. Carroll teaches a method of displaying a text-based editor responsive to the location of a selected object (col. 2, line 31 – col. 3, line11; *the editable region is located above the selected object*). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Carroll's teaching with AAPA's method in order to let users easily and intuitively see what is being edited in proximity of the editing object.

Claims 7 and 14 are similar in scope to claim 5, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 10, the teachings of AAPA in combination with Carroll have been addressed in previous paragraphs. AAPA-Carroll does not expressly disclose the steps of displaying at a second location of a display screen an additional text based editor for at least one selected from adding text to, and altering text of, at least a second portion of the information, at least one selected from the second portion and the second location unresponsive to at least the first set of at least one command. However, Official Notice is taken that opening multiple editors for a same data information is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine this feature with the method of AAPA-Carroll in order to allow users the capability for viewing a plurality of editing portions of a same data

information. Since the two portions of the data information are not the same, a command applied on one portion would not necessarily affect the other.

Claims 49, 51, 54 and 58 are similar in scope to claims 5, 7, 10 and 14 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

6. Claims 15-17, 21-22, 37-39, 43-44, 59-61 and 65-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA", Specification pages 1-3).

As per claims 15-16, while AAPA teaches a windowed-based text editor (page 3, lines 1-4), AAPA does not explicitly disclose the text-based editor operating in one of a plurality of modes of operation responsive to at least one command, and the steps of identifying a label responsive to the indication of the at least one command, wherein the displaying step is responsive to the initial text identified, and wherein the label identifies the one of the plurality of modes of operation of the text-based editor. Official Notice is taken that menu of commands, such as a pull-down menu with labels identifying each function of the menu commands, being employed in a windowed-based text editor, is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include such a menu type with the method of AAPA in order to provide users with a convenient and efficient way of organizing pertinent editing commands.

Claim 17 is similar in scope to claim 15, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claims 21-22, AAPA does not expressly disclose the steps of selecting a subset of text responsive to a command, as well as checking text syntax and altering the text responsive to the checking step. However, all of these steps are well known in the text editing art. It would

have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include these features with AAPA's method in order to provide users with common and expected editing functionalities.

Claims 37-39 and 43-44 are similar in scope to claims 15-17 and 21-22 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 59-61 and 65-66 are similar in scope to claims 15-17 and 21-22 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

7. Claims 18-20, 40-42 and 62-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA", Specification pages 1-3) in view of Seybold et al. ("Seybold", US 6,005,973).

As per claims 18 and 20, while AAPA inherently teaches the text-based editor to accept at least one word, AAPA does not explicitly indicate that the accepted word is from a plurality of possible words, and the step of displaying the plurality of words, and the plurality of possible words comprising at least one value of an attribute, and the displaying of the plurality of possible words is responsive to at least one value of each of at least one corresponding attribute in the set of information. Seybold teaches a method of comparing dictionary entries to input entries, and providing a list of possible/candidate words depending on the combinations of the inputted characters (col. 4, lines 54 et seq.). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Seybold's teaching with AAPA in order to help users by providing suggestions for likely candidate of desired words or word corrections.

As per claim 19, AAPA-Seybold does not expressly teach the steps of displaying of the plurality of possible words to be response to a location of a cursor in the text editor. However,

such steps are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include such a feature with the method of AAPA-Seybold in order to provide users with a quick and convenient means for viewing word suggestions/corrections that the system may have regarding the word on which the cursor rests.

Claims 40-42 are similar in scope to claims 18-20 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 62-64 are similar in scope to claims 18-20 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 23 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Dreamweaver 2 does not teach the following: (a) the code editor adds text to and alters text of the source code for the entire web page, not a portion as claimed; and (b) the location of the text editor and the portion are responsive to a set of at least one command in the graphical editor as claimed.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons.

Per (a), Dreamweaver 2 does not explicitly or implicitly indicate that the code editor adds/alters text of the source code for the entire web page (emphasis added). While Dreamweaver 2 discloses that the source code window is displayed alongside the graphics window (page 3, paragraph 1), Dreamweaver 2 does not indicate that the code window must always display the code for the entire web page. There is always an instant where the web page

contains a large amount of both text and graphics information, and resulting in only a portion of the web page being presented at any given time; thus it would require the user to scroll up/down in order to view/edit other portions of the web page. It is noted that the claim language only requires the displaying of a text editor for adding/altering text of a portion of the information. The claim language is thus still read on by Dreamweaver 2 as explained above.

Per (b), by disclosing in page 3, paragraph 1, "as an author makes changes to the graphics window, the code window is automatically updated and vice versa," (emphasis added), Dreamweaver suggests that the text editor and the relevant portion of information are responsive to the commands in the graphics window.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sy Luu whose telephone number is (571) 272-4064. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:300 am to 4:00 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (571) 272-4063.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



SY D. LUU
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2174